

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30, 32, and 41-43 have been resubmitted. Claims 28 and 41 have been amended. Claims 31, 39, and 40 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner rejected Claims 28, 29, 39, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Chiang (U.S. Pat. No. 4,813,470). The Examiner rejected Claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Terkelsen (U.S. Pat. No. 4,289,570).

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that Claims 1-27, 30, 32, 42, and 43 are allowed.

The Examiner objected to Claim 41, but stated that Claim 41 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Examiner's Interview

On April 14, 2005, the Applicant's attorney and the Examiner participated in a telephonic interview regarding the substance of the rejections contained in the Examiner's Final Office Action, dated March 11, 2005. The participants discussed claim 28. The Examiner maintained that Claim 28 referred to a product by manufacture, and maintained that since the same product was being produced by Chiang, it would not matter how the product was manufactured since the end result would be indistinguishable. The Applicant pointed out that the product described by Chiang and the product described by the Applicant were each cooled in different ways, i.e., from the perimeter inwardly (Chiang)

and from the base upwardly (Applicant). No agreement was reached as to the allowability of Claim 28 or the remainder of the rejected claims, as the Examiner maintained that the same argument applied to the remaining rejected claims.

Objected to Claim 41

Claim 41 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Accordingly, Claim 41 as amended should be allowable.

Canceled Claims

Claims 31, 39, and 40 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

Amended Claims

Claim 28 has been amended to place it into condition for allowance. Claim 28 has been amended to include the limitation contained in allowable Claim 30, i.e. "where adjacent airfoils have grain boundary misorientations as high as about 18.0 degrees"; the remaining wording of allowable Claim 30 is identical with the wording of Claim 28. Additionally, Claim 28 contains the limitation "wherein the integral ring comprises: an inner rim, a plurality of airfoils integral with the inner rim, and an outer rim integral with the inner rim and with the plurality of airfoils" (Claim 28, lines 18-22). If amended Claim 28 contains all the limitations of Claim 30 and Claim 30 is allowable, then Claim 28 as amended should also be allowable. Rejected Claim 29 depends upon Claim 28, but if Claim 28 is allowable, then Claim 29 should now also be allowable.

CONCLUSION

All rejected claims have been canceled or amended to contain all the limitations of allowable claims, and all objected to claims have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since only allowable claims remain in the application, the Applicant has now placed the application in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance in this case.

In the event the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:




Michael A. Shimokaji
Attorney Registration No. 32,303

Honeywell International Inc.
Law Dept. AB2
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806
(602) 365-2588
Attn: Robert Desmond

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on

5/5/05


Michael A. Shimokaji, Reg. No. 32,303